[1st November 1932

A.—(*a*) An order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed but the order prohibited only meetings, demonstrations or propaganda against payment of rent legitimately due to the Udaiyarpalaiyam Zamindar and towards the offering of resistance to the zamin officials in the attachment of properties.

(*b*) A copy[a] of the order of the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Jayankonda-Cholapuram, dated 3rd June 1932, under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, giving reasons for its promulgation, is laid on the table of the House.

Police

Police help to the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam.

* 259-B *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: With reference to question No. 87 answered on 3rd August 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether the further information, promised to be called for, has been received; and, if so, whether it will be placed on the table of the House?

A.—The information received is as follows:—

From June 1931 there existed a dispute between the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam and some of his tenants. Persons alleged to be the enemies of the Zamindar are reported to have started a 'no-rent' campaign against him. They held numerous meetings in various villages at which speeches were made advising the ryots not to pay rents to the Zamindar, to molest the collection agents and to intimidate and boycott those tenants who did not abide by their decisions. The feelings between the Zamindar and his tenants became strained, rents were not paid and on the night of the 13th July 1931 a hayrick belonging to the Zamindar was set fire to. As the situation had become serious the District Superintendent of Police visited the locality, made personal enquiries into the matter and had some ring-leaders charged under section 107, Criminal Procedure Code.

2. As a breach of the peace was anticipated, a prohibitory order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was issued as a result of which the situation became temporarily normal. But certain persons alleged to be the enemies of the Zamindar again started the 'no-rent campaign,' and threatened the zamin officials and patta monigars with acts of violence. The District Magistrate therefore held a conference of all ryots on 17th November 1931 at which the Zamindar was present. The Zamindar announced certain concessions, but the ryots were not

---

[a] Printed as Appendix VII on page 256 infra.

1st November 1932]

satisfied and went so far as to attack him in his car. As further trouble was expected, a party of reserve police was temporarily quartered at the Zamindar's residence to prevent any disturbance of the peace.

3. Everything went on smoothly for sometime and collections proceeded peacefully till March 1932, when the situation again changed for the worse. Certain persons again began to hold secret meetings and advise tenants to agitate against the collection of rents. The ryots began to assault the zamin officials and a serious breach of the peace between the two parties was apprehended. An order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was therefore promulgated in eight villages. In June 1932 the District Superintendent of Police went to Udayarpalaiyam with a party of reserve police. He visited the villages, interviewed the leaders and tenants and warned them against illegal action and advised them to adopt constitutional methods. As a result the situation returned to normal and rents were paid.

4. The reserve party remained in Udayarpalaiyam from the 7th to the 16th June 1932 when everything appeared quiet enough to warrant their departure. They visited the affected villages in the zamindari accompanied by the District Superintendent of Police, but not by the Zamindar's band and officials.

5. The police interference was in the interest of law and order. No contribution was asked for from the Zamindar or paid by him.

Arrest and detention of Messrs. Saravam Pillai and Pichai Pillai of Udaiyarpalaiyam.

* 259-C *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that in the month of August 1931 Messrs. Saravam Pillai and Pichai Pillai of Angarayanallore, Udaiyarpalaiyam taluk, Trichinopoly district, were arrested and kept in remand;

(*b*) if so, under what section and for what offence were they arrested and under whose orders;

(*c*) whether any warrant was obtained by the police before they were arrested; if not, why not;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that they were arrested and kept in remand on the 14th of August whereas the first information report against them was recorded and forwarded only on the 16th of that month;

(*e*) if so, what were the reasons for this irregularity in procedure and what action the Government propose to take against those responsible; and